

REMARKS

This communication is in regards to the Office Action of September 20, 2007.

The Examiner objected to the drawings. Regarding objections 5a and 5b that the drawings are informal and that some of the figures are too dark, it is respectfully submitted that formal drawings of sufficient quality were previously submitted by Applicant on November 23, 2003 and resubmitted on December 8, 2004 such that these objections are moot. In the file history of this case, the USPTO erroneously issued a notice of abandonment on October 15, 2004. Applicant submitted a petition on December 8, 2004 providing evidence that a reply to the notice to file missing parts was timely filed. The petition included a true copy of the reply and included 15 sheets of formal drawings. The notice of abandonment was subsequently withdrawn by the USPTO on September 9, 2005. Private PAIR has the formal drawings accorded a mail room date of January 26, 2005. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the USPTO has acknowledged receipt of formal drawings and that the formal drawings have been entered into the USPTO database such that objections 5a and 5b are moot.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that no further corrections of the drawings are required in response to objections 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, and 5g. Regarding Figure 6, the figure clearly shows present/future EPG information on one surface 605 and "past" PVR data on the other surface 620 as described in paragraphs [0040]-[0041]. Figure 7 has a PVR surface 730 as described in paragraph [0043], "PVR data is represented on the second surface 730." Figure 8 shows a rotated view of the three-dimensional image of Figure 7, as described in paragraph [0044]. Figure 9 illustrates a drawer opening up, as described in paragraph [0045]. Figure 10 shows a list 1005 ("Lord of the Rings" and "Star Wars").

The Examiner objected to the specification in paragraph [0053]. Applicant has amended paragraph [0053] in accordance with one of the Examiner's suggested corrections.

Claim 34 was cancelled. Consequently it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claim 34 is moot.

In response the prior art rejection of claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite limitations not taught or suggested by the cited prior art related to facilitating an

end-user navigating between EPG information and PVR information. As described in paragraph [0004] a problem in the prior art was that consumers had difficulty navigating back and forth between EPG and PVR information. Referring to paragraph [0044], in one embodiment a user can change the viewpoint of the three dimensional image to facilitate navigating between EPG and PVR information. However, a partial view of the other surface is maintained to provide contextual information to assist the user to switch back and forth between EPG information and PVR information. This is also illustrated in Figures 6-8, which illustrate a three dimensional surface having an EPG surface and a PVR surface rotated in response to a user command. In the examples of Figures 7-8, the three-dimensional surface is rotated from a first position in which the EPG is face-on (Figure 7) to a second position in which the PVR surface is face-on (Figure 8). However, a partial view of other surface is maintained to facilitate a user navigating back and forth between PVR information and EPG information.

Claim 1 was amended to recite a limitation that the three dimensional image simultaneously displays EPG information on a first surface and PVR information on a second surface orthogonal to the first. Claim 1 was also amended to describe an embodiment in which the viewpoint of the three dimensional image may be changed in response to user input to provide a detailed view of one of the surfaces while maintaining a partial view of the other surface to facilitate navigating between EPG and PVR information. Claims 2 and 3 were amended to describe in more particularity embodiments in which a user selects the viewpoint to bring one of the surfaces into a face-on view. Claim 3 was amended to further clarify that the change in viewpoint corresponds to an axial rotation to bring one of the surface into a face-on view. It is respectfully submitted that Eiref and the other cited art do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1, 2, and 3.

In response to the prior art rejection of claim 38, Applicant has amended claim 38 to describe an embodiment in which the three-dimensional image has a curved surface for displaying EPG information as media thumbnails on a circumference of the curved surface. Claim 38 was further amended to clarify that the apparent area of the media thumbnails depends on their orientation on the curved surface with the level of detail that is displayed in a media thumbnail being dependent on its area. New claims 56-60

recited additional limitations on the level of detail that is displayed. Support for this amendment is found in paragraphs [0034]-[0035] [0049]-[0050]. It is respectfully submitted that the cited art does not teach or suggest varying a level of detail in combination with the other limitations of claim 38.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that no further impediments exist to the allowance of this application and, therefore, requests an indication of allowability. However, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned if any questions or comments arise.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1283.

Dated: 12/12/2007

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5625
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

By: 
Edward Van Gieson
Reg. No. 44,386